

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Eric Flores

v.

Case No. 13-fp-1

United States Attorney General et al.

Eric Flores

v.

Case No. 13-fp-72

United States Attorney General et al.

**O R D E R**

Eric Flores has filed two actions, captioned above, in this court. The complaints in these cases are identical or nearly identical, name the same defendants, and arise out of the same factual allegations. Each action alleges that defendants are participating in an effort to harm Mexican-American United States citizens by transmitting genetic codes through satellites located in outer space, in order to cause death, cocaine addiction, or other harm to Mexican-Americans, including a number of Flores's relatives.

Rule 42(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure permits actions before the court to be consolidated if they "involve a common question of law or fact." This court's local

rules permit the court to "enter an initial consolidation order on its own initiative directing that, unless an objection is filed within a specified time," two or more "related cases" pending before the court may be consolidated. United States District Court District of New Hampshire Local Rule ("LR") 42.1(c); see also LR 42.1(a) (defining "related cases").<sup>1</sup> If no objection to consolidation is filed, the court may issue an order consolidating the cases. See LR 42.1(e).

The court, upon review of the complaints filed by Flores in each above-captioned matter, finds that the cases are related, in that they arise out of the same alleged transactions, involve the same parties, and include the same issues. Accordingly, unless Flores files an objection within fourteen days of the date of this order, these petitions shall be consolidated into Flores v. U.S. Atty. Gen'l, No. 13-fp-1, an order consolidating the petitions, for all purposes, shall issue, and the later-filed case, Flores v. U.S. Atty. Gen'l, No. 13-fp-72, will be

---

<sup>1</sup>LR 42.1(a) states:

Related cases are cases which: (1) arise from substantially the same transaction or event; (2) involve substantially the same parties or property; (3) involve the same patent, trademark, or copyright; (4) call for the resolution of substantially the same questions of law; or (5) would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

terminated.

Any response to this order shall be filed individually in each of the above-referenced cases. This order shall also be docketed individually in each case. Failure to file an objection as directed will result in the court's consolidation of the two actions for all purposes.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Daniel Lynch  
Daniel Lynch  
United States Magistrate Judge

February 22, 2013

cc: Eric Flores, pro se